DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 421 060 HE 031 404

AUTHOR Rees, Ruth
TITLE An Equitable Recruitment and Hiring Process in the Academy? A Case Study.
PUB DATE 1998-04-00
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association, (San Diego, CA, April, 13-17, 1998).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; *College Faculty; Decision Making; *Equal Opportunities (Jobs); Faculty College Relationship; *Faculty Recruitment; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *Personnel Policy; *Personnel Selection; Policy Formation; Schools of Education
IDENTIFIERS *Queens University of Kingston (Canada)

ABSTRACT

This paper describes the process of faculty recruitment and hiring in the Faculty of Education at Queen's University at Kingston (Ontario). The paper describes briefly, 13 features of an equitable search process, including identifying the unit's needs, goals, and personnel gaps; determining the criteria for the position; determining the interview questions; conducting the interviews; selecting a candidate for the position; and orienting the incumbent to the unit. How these steps are applied is then recounted in some detail for the recruitment and hiring of four tenure-track faculty. Also provided are examples of feedback on the process from the faculty at large, the newly hired faculty members, and the search committee. Among summary reflections are that each step must be carried out in a fair manner and be communicated to all stakeholders, that open and continuous communication within the faculty is as important as communication with applicants, and that striving for equity is difficult and takes continuous analysis and reflection. Appendixes include a sample advertisement for faculty positions and a checklist of criteria for reviewing applications. (Contains 10 references.) (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 421 060

HE

AN EQUITABLE RECRUITMENT AND HIRING PROCESS IN THE ACADEMY? A CASE STUDY

by

Ruth Rees, PhD

Faculty of Education
Queen's University at Kingston

Paper presented at the American Education Research Association conference in San Diego, CA, April 1998

HE 031 404

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Ruth Rees
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

AN EQUITABLE RECRUITMENT AND HIRING PROCESS IN THE ACADEMY?

A CASE STUDY

Recruiting and hiring for any institution is considered by some to be an opportunity; recruiting new university faculty members in the late 1990's is considered a rare opportunity. Why? For more than a decade, the university community has not been hiring new faculty members in significant numbers. Declining budgets and hence decreasing numbers of faculty positions coupled with low faculty turnover and some early retirement programs to entice faculty members retire early have been more the norm than institutional growth. Consequently, the recruitment and hiring of new faculty is an exciting opportunity in current *academe*, not experienced for a while.

It is a time for organizational renewal and hopefulness -- knowing that necessary vacancies will be finally filled, providing some continuity in terms of teaching and perhaps even complementing other faculty members' research interests. Yet, it is also a period of doubt and uncertainty. With federal legislation for equity, university officials are obligated to ensure that its faculty members are increasingly diverse and more representative of its student enrolment. The sceptics wonder if the process will unearth the *best* person for the position, how the person will be received by colleagues and students, how long the person will remain in the university and if the hiring decision will be grieved. Recruiting and hiring for any institution not only the academy is an important responsibility and should not be taken on lightly.

The purpose of this paper is widen the knowledge base about the recruitment and hiring process in a university setting. Specifically, the purpose is threefold: one, to document the recruitment and hiring process undertaken by one university department — the Faculty of Education at Queen's University in Kingston, Ontario, Canada; two, to describe one cycle of that process; and three, to share insight gained from implementing that process and obtain feedback about it. The aim of the recruitment committee was not only to hire the best person for the position, but also to ensure an **equitable** recruitment and hiring process -- one which might be used as a template by future hiring committees. To obtain feedback on the process, those people who were offered appointments as a result of this hiring cycle were solicited, as were faculty members, members involved in the hiring process itself and two individuals in equity-related positions within the university but external to the Faculty of Education. By means of this paper, through its dissemination to a broader university audience, I hope to receive more feedback as to suggestions for improving one recruitment and hiring process.

Certainly the recruitment and hiring process in itself is neither new nor without documentation. Indeed, the steps for faculty hiring are clearly outlined in universities' collective agreements on hiring policies and in many articles, for example by Half (1985), Perlman and McCann (1996), Ryan and Martinson (1996), and Tucker (1993). The steps involved in the hiring process in general are quite straightforward, albeit time-consuming. Briefly and in a comprehensive form, the search process has the features which are incorporated into Table 1 below.

Table 1

Features of an Equitable Search Process

1. Identify the unit's needs, goals, and hence personnel gaps;
2. Create a representative committee;
3. Determine the criteria for the position;
4. Draft and place the advertisement;
5. Review and assess materials from candidates;
6. Create a short list;
7. Determine the interview questions;
8. Plan the site visit;
9. Conduct the interviews;
10. Assess the files, post-interview;
11. Select a candidate for the position;
12. Document the process; and
13. Orientate the incumbent to the unit.

This process, as Half (1985) described is a generic one. All personnel searches should include the above steps; but, in reality, many of these steps are overlooked or left up to a secretary (e.g., planning the site visit). Each of these 13 steps involves another whole process in itself. But all stages must be open and transparent so that equity is not just espoused, but actually practiced (Queen's University, 1995). Briefly, each step is described below.

1. *Identify the unit's needs, goals, and hence personnel gaps*. Usually the unit head and/or group responsible for strategic or long-term planning of the unit collaborates to identify where the unit is going and what types of positions are required to be filled. In my university, the unit head meets with the Vice-Principal (Academic) to approve each academic vacancy.

2. *Create a representative committee*. Bugliani (1992), Coady (1990) and Half (1985) are just several who write that the composition of the search committee is essential, particularly if the committee is attempting to hire traditionally represented people. A diverse search committee is

more likely to value differences in people. Moreover, a diverse search committee actually demonstrates to the short-listed candidate that the committee is serious about widening the academic pool.

3,4. *Determine the criteria for the position, and draft and place the advertisement*. These steps are often carried out simultaneously. The advertisement must accurately reflect the criteria required for the position and must be specific enough to deter anyone with the general background from applying (Bugliani, 1992; Ryan & Martinson, 1996). The criteria must be free of systemic discrimination (if possible). Often the criteria are kept confidential until the interviews are completed.

5,6. *Review the applicants' files, and create a short-list*. The applicants' files are compared to the criteria. Often input is solicited from faculty with expertise in that same field as the applicant. And generally referees are contacted only if the applicant has been short-listed for an interview.

7. *Determine the interview questions and format*. Coady (1990) suggests that descriptive or behavioural interviewing be carried out, where the candidate is asked how she/he would respond or has responded in a particular situation.

8. *Plan the site visit*. This step has often been omitted in the search process, yet it is a very essential one, and even more so if the committee is trying to entice academics who represent women or minority groups to the university. Who hosts the candidate? Will the unit head have an opportunity to meet with the candidate? What types of accommodation does the candidate require? Are all aspects of the site visited considered in order to provide a welcoming climate for the candidate? Coady (1990) also suggests that the site visit include meetings with the candidate's prospective colleagues, include teaching simulations and opportunities for students to

interact with the candidate in both informal and formal situations.

9. *Conduct the interviews*. The committee should ask similar questions of each candidate, and provide an opportunity for the candidate to ask questions. Notes should be taken by all members of the committee, with the criteria as a guide. Some criteria are unable to be assessed on the paper qualifications (such as excellent oral communications) and require the face-to-face interview.

10,11,12. *Assess the file post-interview, select a candidate for the position, and document the process*. Based on paper qualifications, input from all members of the search committee and any other member of the academic community, the search committee must re-assess each of the short-listed candidates. In my university, the chair must write a detailed letter to the unit head describing the number of applicants and short-listed candidates, and why the committee recommends (or not) a particular candidate for the position. Furthermore, a full report of the committee's activities should be written and open for public scrutiny and review..

13. *Orientate the incumbent to the unit.* Boice (1992) insists that this step should be addressed in order to ensure that new faculty are welcomed *de facto* by members in the unit. This initial climate, he says, has a lot to ensure newcomers' longevity.

Ryan and Martinson (1996) identify six broad categories of concern associated with the recruiting process: advertising the job, providing adequate information to the applicants; treating candidates honestly, conducting campus interviews, avoiding problems in searches; and dealing with discrimination. They offer suggestions as to how problems in each of those components of the process. They recognize, however, that each contributes to the overall success of the process.

In this paper, each of the steps are discussed in relation to the work of the search committee that was carried out in the Faculty of Education. Then the feedback which the committee solicited and received from faculty and others are documented and commented upon. Finally, some recommendations will be made. While this is a description of a search process of just one university department, its findings may prove useful for others. The reader is cautioned that this case study is unique in several ways which require clarification. The purpose of this specific process was to hire, over a two-year span, a maximum of eight faculty members for the Faculty of Education at Queen's University at Kingston. Four points make this process distinctive and hence merit documentation. They are: one, this hiring process was an attempt at hiring people from broad areas within Education, rather than specific subspecialities (e.g., **not** secondary English, but someone from the area of language and literacy); two, one omnibus search committee was established for the hiring, over a two-year period, of all eight faculty positions; and three, the committee was intent on developing and carrying out practices within the process in order to realize the university's statement that it is "an employment equity employer." Not content with merely recording the process, the committee agreed that it wanted to learn from and improve upon this process. This is the fourth unique aspect of this hiring process. The process and the feedback and reflection of this process is included in the documentation below.

The Education Hiring Process

The Faculty of Education at Queen's University in Kingston has had all its full-time tenure track positions frozen for four years (1993-1997), along with most other units at the university. Dramatically reduced funding at the provincial level, a government edict to look at programs

systemically (across the province) rather than institutionally and an outgoing Dean, all contributed to the hiring freeze. Then, in September 1995, a new Dean began her tenure and energized the Faculty. The previously-defunct strategic planning committee, a standing committee of Faculty Board, was asked by the Dean to clarify the mandate of the Faculty and then to identify, through faculty-wide collaboration, those tenure-track positions that required filling in order for the Faculty to better meet its mandate. Over the course of the 1995-96 academic year, that committee solicited input from faculty members and developed a priority list complete with rationale for each of those positions. Step one of the hiring process was indeed accomplished.

Annually in November, all Deans meet with the Academic Vice-President in order to justify and hopefully gain approval for the positions identified within their Faculty. Accordingly, at the November 1996 staffing meeting, the Dean of Education gained approval to advertise for a maximum of eight tenure-track faculty positions. The agreement was that all positions would be advertised at once (for expediency and efficiency) and that not all these positions would be filled in the first year. The Faculty was guaranteed these positions for at least two years. Next, the Dean wrote up an advertisement and asked for feedback on the ad from members of the Education Faculty as well as from the university's legal advisor. Advertisements, according to university policy, were placed in the one national newspaper and in two national academic newsletters. The advertisement (see Appendix I) appeared in press in early January and February with a closing date of 15 March 1997. All applications were given to the search committee for review. Complete files consisted of a covering letter, a curriculum vitae, three references and a sample of the applicant's writing.

A committee, called the Omnibus Search Committee, was formed representing the view of the Faculty as a whole and to provide expertise for the eight positions. The committee of eight was composed of two full professors (one who was the chair), two associate professors, one assistant professor, the Associate Dean, one preservice teacher education student (a student with a first degree and now in the one-year professional program) and one Education graduate student. Because eight diverse positions requiring filling, the committee was broad-based (i.e., someone on the committee had some expertise on at least one of the areas where a vacancy existed). I had two roles on that committee: one as a regular member and the other as the "equity officer" under the University's collective agreement with responsibilities to monitor the procedures and to ensure that equitable practices were followed. As the collective agreement had just been signed, this was the first iteration of its implementation. The only principles that the committee was given to follow were:

- no discrimination on the basis of the ground prohibited in the Ontario Human Rights Code;
- to ensure that each step of the process was fair and equitable;
- to ensure that the process was accountable and that reasons for decisions were made available; and
- to review the criteria applied to ensure that they were free of systemic bias.

Of the eight-person committee, the chair was male, only one (of six) of the faculty members was female, both students were women, one being a woman of color. Due to a lack of representation

currently existing within the Faculty, no other women faculty members were able to be on the committee. Furthermore, no faculty represented Aboriginal peoples, minority cultural/racial groups, or people with disabilities were on the committee.

I shared copies of the University's Hiring guidelines for faculty appointments (1995) with other committee members and we discussed the applicable passages from the newly-formed collective agreement concerning equitable faculty recruiting and hiring practices. Trainers from the Office of Human Resources at the university responsible for training administrators for staff recruitment and hiring addressed our committee on common pitfalls of the hiring process. Prior to that meeting, a video was distributed to all members for viewing entitled "Communicating across cultures." The half-day program on recruitment and hiring included an overview of pertinent federal legislation, a review of our selection criteria, guidance on asking behavioral-oriented interview questions based on our selection criteria, interviewing etiquette and how to accommodate to candidates' special needs.

The search committee met frequently -- one morning each week for four months. Formal meetings were held with an agenda; minutes were taken and reviewed at each subsequent meeting. The first thing the committee addressed was the issue of outreach. How and where could the notice be advertised in order to reach a broad audience including some of the non-traditional groups currently under-represented in the academy? Faculty specializing in each of the disciplines advertised were contacted as to the journals, electronic listserves, electronic bulletin boards, conferences and the like in their field; attempts were made to place the ad in as many of

these sources are were available and feasible (due to time and monetary constraints). Three Aboriginal newspapers were contacted in which to place the ad. Also the advertisement was posted at one national conference held during that time.

While waiting for the closing date of the advertisement, the search committee worked diligently to determine some generic criteria for screening the applications. That process was a most useful one and helped the committee coalesce. After several iterations and with input from the faculty as a whole, criteria were determined (see Appendix II). There was unanimous agreement that only those applicants who had completed or almost completed their doctoral dissertation would be considered. Each of the eight committee members took charge of applications from one of the disciplines advertised. Each member was to apply those criteria ruthlessly. That person would screen all applications against the criteria and would make three piles: definite "no," "maybe," and "a great application." At the weekly meetings, each committee member justified to the group the reasons why each "no" application was rejected. Committee members asked probing questions and some requested to read the file themselves.

The second task was for all members to read the applications in the "maybe" pile, comparing each application to ones in the third pile of "great applications." In addition, each committee member chose another committee member to go over the same set of applications and resolve any differences between themselves regarding their decisions (inter-rater reliability). As before, all applications put into the "no" pile were discussed at the weekly meetings and put aside. Several iterations of these two phases were carried out until ten days after the closing date of the

advertisement, when it was agreed that no more applications would be considered during this cycle for these positions. In total, 229 applicants applied to at least one of the eight positions, totalling. 325 applications. The large number of applications, many of which were not directly relevant to any of the advertised positions, made the committee realize that it was imperative in future ads to specify more detail about each position. Moreover, the committee agreed that with a more detailed advertisement, the Dean might have received less general queries.

Table 2 below reveals the total number of applications received by discipline advertised. Eight people applied to an "assistant professor" position, not specifying any discipline. Of all the applicants, only one of the 229 self-identified as representing an under-represented group. Data were maintained by sex of the applicant because that was the only variable that was clearly distinctive in the applications. Over 50% of the applications were from women; twice as many applications from women were received for the Elementary Curriculum position; more than twice as many men than women applied for the Mathematics and Technology position. The fewest number of applications was for the Counselling and Career Guidance position; this position was more in anticipation of a future need. The low response rate was puzzling. It may have reflected the lack of precise information in the advertisement for this position, a lack of interest of people with that background, or that few people qualified in this discipline.

Table 2

Distribution of applications received by discipline and gender

Discipline	**Female**		**Male**		**Total**	
	#	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**

Language and Literacy	44	62.9	26	37.1	70	21.5
Mathematics and Technology	9	32.1	19	67.9	28	8.6
Science and Society	13	46.4	15	53.6	28	8.6
Counselling & Career Guidance	8	47.1	9	52.9	17	5.2
Cultural Studies	42	56.8	32	43.2	74	22.8
Cognitive Studies	15	55.6	12	44.4	27	8.3
Elementary Curriculum	21	67.7	10	32.3	31	9.5
Social & Environmental Studies	21	50.0	21	50.0	42	12.9
Assistant Professor	5	62.5	3	37.5	8	2.5
Total	**178**	**54.8%**	**147**	**45.2%**	**325**	**99.9%**

The third assignment was to rank all the applications in the third pile (those "great applications"). For each of the eight positions, several people were involved in this task: one, the committee member responsible for the particular discipline, one other committee member, and at least two faculty members who were knowledgeable of the same discipline as the one advertised. For example, no one on the committee was an expert in Cognitive Studies, one of the areas advertised. Accordingly, all Education Psychology professors were requested to review the files, to rank order the applicants and to comment in writing as to their "fit" with the position advertised and within the Faculty. The criteria that the committee developed were kept confidential to committee members (see Appendix II).

The most difficult meeting of the committee was the full day session when the committee short-listed some applicants in each of the eight academic areas. Each file was discussed with information supplied from those professors within the Faculty who had also read the files. At the end of that marathon session, the committee unanimously agreed to the following:

- The committee asked the Dean to approve two positions (not just the one advertised) in

Language and Literacy -- one for elementary and one for secondary. She did and subsequently, three people were short-listed for the Language and Literacy positions — two for secondary education and one for elementary education.

- Only one person was short-listed for the Social and Environmental Studies position, another position for which a wide range of applications were received. The lack of specific information in the advertisement was considered partly responsible for this situation.
- The committee short-listed two people for the Cognitive Studies position.
- Three people were put on the Cultural Studies short-list. One person who had been interviewed twice before for a transition position within the Faculty was considered outstanding by members of the committee. The Faculty, however, had been unsuccessful in obtaining funding for that transitional position and hence had not been able to offer her even a temporary position. Consequently, as she had been interviewed twice already, the committee recommended to the Dean that she be offered the position immediately. The Dean concurred with this recommendation and promptly offered the candidate the Cultural Studies tenure-track position which she accepted.

Once the short-lists were identified, the committee asked the Dean to request letters of reference for all those short-listed candidates.

The next task of the search committee was to develop the questions that they would ask of each candidate (for the presentation and for the subsequent interview) and to plan for the site visit. Each candidate was asked beforehand to prepare a talk of about 40 minutes in length dealing with

her/his most current research. The title of the presentation was to be forwarded to the chair of the search committee so that the chair could inform the Education community at large as to the subject of the presentation.

Table 3 below lists the questions asked of the committee in the interview:

Table 3

Interview Questions

1. *Do you have a criminal record?*
2. *If appointed, would you plan to live within the Kingston area?*
   [These first two questions were cleared with the VP(Academic) of the university.]
3. *What is your experience, given the expectations that we have of our colleagues regarding how you might act as a liaison in the schools?*
4. *How do you see your involvement with the field, and how would this be enacted?*
5. *What is your philosophy of education and how is this manifested in your teaching?*
6. *What innovative approaches do you employ in your teaching?*
7. *How has your research informed your own teaching?*
8. *What courses do you see yourself teaching in our BEd, MEd., and Continuing Education programs?*
9. *Where has your teaching experience with students been and what has the experience been like? What have you learned from it?*
10. *What direction would you like your research to take and what plans do you have for taking it there?*
11. *What opportunities do you see in our Faculty of Education for cooperating in research with specific colleagues?*

Each of the visits was hosted by different members of the search committee. The host contacted the candidate before the visit to the Faculty and asked about special needs. Two different types of accommodation were made: one person requested to meet with a faculty member whose work she refers to in her own writing; another person asked if her spouse could come and arrangements were made for him to meet with local school education officials. Candidates were given the day's

itinerary in advance consisting of: an interview with the Dean, separate meetings with undergraduate and graduate students, lunch, the candidate's one hour presentation on her or his latest research (40 minute to present, 20 minutes to answer questions), a one and one-half hour interview in which those questions in Table 3 were asked by committee members followed by an opportunity for the applicant to ask questions of the committee, a tour of the facilities, university and city (depending on time and interest) and then dinner. It was indeed a full day! People from the applicant's own discipline were invited to the meals as were members of the search committee. Flowers and a couple of books authored by Education faculty members were put in the candidate's hotel room with a welcoming note from the Dean.

The interviews proceeded very smoothly and as planned. The presentation was open to members of the Education community and many attended. The presentation was to allow the candidate an opportunity to inform possible future colleagues the type of research in which the candidate was involved, to observe the candidate in a teaching situation, and to assess the candidate's oral communication skills.

Those faculty and students who attended the presentation or who met with the candidate were asked to provide written feedback as to the quality of the presentation, one-third did provide some feedback to the chair of the committee. Post-assessment sessions were held after each of the three sets of interview. Comments from non-committee members were shared with committee members at this debriefing session. Each candidate was discussed. The chair took notes to ensure that the positive and negative aspects of each of the candidates were carefully documented.

The chair then wrote to the Dean recommending a particular candidate, complete with reasons.

As a result of these three sets of recommendations from the search committee, the Dean made three tenure-track appointments: for Elementary and Secondary Language and Literacy, and one in Cognitive Studies. All were hired for 1 September 1997. Immediately the Dean assigned each incoming faculty member a more senior faculty member as a mentor; and each new faculty member was given one half-course release for the first three years in order to get orientated to their new courses and the academic routines and expectations; each was also given an institutional start-up grant which, in most cases, was used to purchase some computer equipment and/or a research assistant. All three are currently on site and, to date, all reports of their contributions to date have been positive. In total, then, four of a possible eight tenure-track appointments were made: three women, one man; one woman who represented a visible minority group.

Feedback on the Process

While the features of the recruitment process end with the final step of orientation of new faculty (Table 1), the selection committee did not believe that its responsibilities ended there. Indeed, four of the eight positions remained to be filled in the subsequent year. Hence, the committee sought feedback in order to improve its recruitment and hiring process. First, the process with which the Faculty of Education undertook to recruit faculty members was scrutinized by an outside equity and a senior administrative officer in the university with a background in law and equity. Both liked what had transpired but asked questions such as, "*Did the committee advertise the positions broadly? Did any applications come in as a result of a non-traditional advertising*

source? How many women, aboriginal peoples, people from minority cultural groups, people who were physically challenged applied and were interviewed? Was the interview held in a place that was accessible? Had the applicants been asked if they had any special requests for accommodation (i.e., any special needs)? Have the questions been reviewed by someone outside the Faculty?" These were all excellent question of equity and most had been considered in the committee's practices.

Input from the faculty at large was limited and somewhat negative: some had wanted to meet with the applicant but did not have the opportunity to do so because of teaching commitments; some articulated that the search committee was not competent to make a decision about the research area or the potential of the applicant as an academic; some said that more of the short-listed candidates should have been members of one of the four under-represented groups recognized by the federal government; some faculty stated that they did not think the search committee was open enough in their deliberations, and in particular regarding keeping the faculty informed as to what stage in the process was the committee.

The newly-hired faculty members were interviewed toward the end of the first term of their appointment and asked about their likes and dislikes of the interview process. Their likes, dislikes and recommendations are described below. First, the likes:

- *the opportunity to meet with both undergraduate and graduate students and having their presence on the committee;*
- *the speed with which the committee made its recommendations;* [Note: Within a week of

the interview, the search committee forwarded a recommendation to the Dean who then offered the successful applicant an appointment in the Faculty.]

- *knowing the size of the short list;*
- *the broad-based composition of the committee;*
- *the warm reception they received by committee members and their host;*
- *a meeting with the Dean early in the day; and*
- *an opportunity to meet with colleagues in the same discipline (i.e., potential future colleagues).*

Their dislikes were:

- *the first two questions asked at the interview* [re criminal record, residency] *and especially the positioning of these questions at the start of the interview;*
- *not having an opportunity to teach a class;*
- *not given more input into the day's schedule (i.e., moving the presentation to the morning, instead of the afternoon and if the candidate wished to eat their with search committee members and/or faculty members sharing the same discipline);*
- *not being able to hear clearly at the restaurant because of the background noise; and*
- *not being informed that they would have to apply in order to be a member of the School of Graduate Studies.*

The recommendations that were made to the committee by the newly-hired faculty members were:

- *provide an opportunity for the applicant to meet (separately) with newer faculty*

members;

- *have the applicant meet with faculty members of the same discipline/field;*
- *have the Dean, rather than the search committee, ask the first two questions (re criminal record and place of residency);*
- *allow the interviewee to have more input into the day's schedule (re meals, timing of presentation);*
- *have one-on-one meetings with the candidate and each member of the search committee to supplement the group interview;*
- *have the candidate teach a class;*
- *allow for some down time after the applicant's presentation and before the interview with the selection committee; and*
- *have group dinners in places/restaurants which are relatively quiet.*

In its final report to the Dean, the search committee made the following recommendations for the next phase (Munby, 1997):

1. "That the Strategic Planning Committee meet with the Omnibus Search Committee to review the areas being advertised in light of program needs.
2. That special attention be given to defining the Mathematics and Technology position as either an Elementary mathematics position or an Elementary Design and Technology position.
3. That consideration be given to defining the Mathematics and Technology, Science and Society, and Social and Environmental positions as elementary curriculum positions.
4. That the Counselling and Career Guidance position be advertised aggressively by personal

contact with potential doctoral supervisors across the country. Generally, applicants for this position in the first phase had little school experience and this position is viewed as significantly connected to curriculum.

5. That the advertisement be altered to reflect the outcome of discussions on these recommendations, [particularly with respect to the details of each position].

6. That the advertising begin early in the fall of 1997 [the subsequent fall]."

Summary Reflections

To summarize, the search committee has learned much from its initial implementation of the recruitment and hiring process. Overall, the committee realized that recruiting and hiring new faculty members was a long, complex and more difficult process than was initially thought. Specifically, the committee realized that attention must be paid to the details in the advertisement itself (as Bugliani (1992) asserted), to the questions and order of questions in the interview, and to the specifics of the site visit. The committee acknowledged that each step in the process was a process within itself; each step must be carried out in a fair manner, communicated to all stakeholders, not just to members of the search committee. Not only must each step be equitable, but each must appear to others to be equitable.

At the start of the process, it was understood that clear, consistent and correct information must go to each applicant, as Ryan and Martinson (1996) advised. But what the committee realized was that open and continuous communication **within** the Faculty is equally if not more essential. This means that the committee, at times, may have to proceed somewhat slower than it might

wish to ensure that other members of the department feel included. Second, it means that input must be sought and seriously considered from colleagues in the same discipline as the applicant. This point makes a great deal of sense because for the hiring process to be successful, the candidate must truly be accepted into the department. The future colleagues of the applicant are key players in the new faculty member's adjustment to the university. Boice (1992) reminds the university community of this point as well with his thesis that attention must not only be paid in order to attract the best prospects but also to focus on retaining these individuals. Perhaps the recruitment and hiring process should be expanded considerably in its final component (orientation) with the goal of longevity of new faculty members in mind. And third, open discussion should be held within the committee and with other faculty members as to the reasons for the presentation. Unless it is clear what is being assessed, the results of the evaluation are in question.

Finally, the committee learned that striving for equity is difficult and takes continuous analysis and reflection. Striving for equity is a matter of degree. For example, preparing for the site visit can be carried out very quickly by a functionary or very thoughtfully by the search committee itself to ensure that the site is accessible and that the candidate's specific needs have been accommodated. Having a member on the committee responsible for equity is a good beginning. However, ensuring that the committee seeks and incorporates feedback is integral to the objective of recruiting and ensuring equity in the process.

How could this process be improved? Was this recruitment and hiring process an equitable one? I would like to know others' opinion. Also I would like to know others' criteria in their assessment of this process of recruiting and hiring for the *academe*.

Selected References

Birnbaum, R. (1992). How academic leadership works. Understanding success and failure in the College Presidency. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publ.

Boice, R. (1992). The new faculty member. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publ.

Bugliani, A. (1992). *Strategies for successful hiring.* ADFL Bulletin, 23(2), 26-28.

Coady, S. (1990). *How to hire good faculty.* Paper presented at the Annual International Conference on Teaching Excellent and Conference of Administrator. Austin, Texas.

Half, R. (1985). On hiring. New York: Crown Publishers. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publ.

Munby, H. (1997). *Report of the Omnibus Search Committee to the Dean.* 15 May 1997. Faculty of Education, Queen's University.

Queen's University (1995). Recruitment and hiring for faculty appointments.

Perlman, B., & McCann, L.I. (1996). Recruiting good college faculty: Practical advice for a successful search. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.

Ryan, M., & Martinson, D.L. (1996). *An analysis of faculty recruiting in schools and departments.* Journalism & Mass Communication Educator. Winter, 4-12.

Tucker, A. (1992). Chairing the academic department. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.

Appendix I

Advertisement for Faculty Positions

The Faculty of Education, Queen's University, invites applications for tenure-track positions in the following areas, to be filled over the next two years. The positions, subject to budgetary approval, normally will be at the rank of Assistant Professor, and will begin 1 July 1997 or 1 July 1998.

The positions are in the areas of: Language and Literacy, Mathematics and Technology, Science and Society, Counselling and Career Guidance, Cultural Studies, Cognitive Studies, Elementary Curriculum, and Social and Environmental Studies.

While the applicant may have had specialized experience within a curriculum area at one level of education (i.e., elementary or secondary), it is desirable that she or he have sufficient knowledge to provide leadership in program development at all levels.

Responsibilities include: teaching and curriculum area leadership in undergraduate, graduate and continuing education programs of the Faculty; conducting research and disseminating findings; supervising pre-service and graduate students; and providing service within the university and educational communities.

Requirements: completed doctorate in Education or related field; research experience with peer-reviewed publications; successful teaching experience and knowledge of the Canadian education system. Experience in schools would be an asset.

In accordance with Canadian immigration requirements, this advertisement is directed to Canadian citizens and permanent residents. Queen's University has an employment equity program, welcomes diversity in the workplace and encourages applications from all qualified candidates, including women, Aboriginal peoples, people with disabilities, and visible minorities.

Applicants should forward a letter of application, a curriculum vitae, one sample of professional/scholarly work, and the names of at least three persons to act as referees by 15 March 1997.

Respond to: The Dean, Faculty of Education, Queen's University at Kingston.

Appendix II

Criteria for reviewing applications

APPLICANT _____ **POSITION(S)** _____

REVIEWER _____ _____

DEGREES/ACADEMIC BACKGROUND

A. Critical

Completed doctoral degree/equivalent.	
Research agenda and specific research steps for accomplishing it.	
Academic background congruent with the position advertised.	
Assistant professor level.	

B. Important

Expertise in second area	

PUBLICATIONS

A. Critical

Scholarly & professional publications appropriate to stage of career	

TEACHING

A. Critical

Evidence of teaching excellence.	
Teaching experience school grades & subject germane to position.	
(Note: an "asset" in cognitive studies applications)	
Ability to supervise graduate students	
Commitment to supervising teacher education candidates.	

B. Important

Evidence of teaching at the undergraduate (BEd) and graduate level	
Knowledge of the Canadian education system	
Evidence of ability to provide curriculum leadership	

C. Desirable

Evidence of some reflective practice	
Some association with a teacher education program	

OTHER ATTRIBUTES

A. Critical

Projects a passion for education, students, fellow teachers	
Excellent communicator in speech and writing.	

Collegial, flexible, hardworking, encourages feedback, takes initiative	
Canadian citizen or permanent resident of Canada	

B. Important

Evidence of service beyond teaching and research	
Can both support and enhance existing faculty research interests	

C. Desirable

Member of an under represented group	
Has international links	